

11 AUG 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Intelligence

SUBJECT : Review of Training Program for Career Trainees

REFERENCE : Memorandum for Director of Training from DDI,  
Subject as above, dated 19 July 1967

1. I have reviewed your suggestions which were incorporated in the above-cited reference concerning the Career Training Program and offer the following comments in response.

2. During the first years (1951-1958) of the Junior Officer Training Program--as this Program formerly was known--it is true that the objective was to train a small number of highly selected individuals to assume the most senior positions in the Agency. Accumulated experience demonstrated, however, that such an objective was unrealizable in the majority of cases while at the same time there developed in some quarters the unfortunate impression that JOTs constituted an "elite corps" as distinct from, and more favored than, the Agency's regular professional complement.

3. In 1958, therefore, the Program was re-evaluated and a new concept emerged. Although still selected individually on highly qualitative standards, JOTs no longer were trained on a custom-tailored basis; nor were they rotated any longer through a series of on-the-job assignments throughout the Agency for a period of two or three years. Instead, JOTs were grouped together as a class, were enrolled in a series of basic familiarization courses, at the end of which they were evaluated individually to determine the Directorate or function to which each was best suited. Once this determination had been made, they were enrolled in intensive specialized training courses relating to the area of proposed assignment; finally, each received an on-the-job attachment to develop particular job skills and to provide a basis for judging his suitability for a career within a given Directorate or Office.

4. Although the Program has had an increasing enrollment since 1958, there has not been a departure from this basic system and its techniques. One of the most significant developments, however--and the one to which presumably you refer in paragraph (2) of your memorandum--was the decision made by the Director of Central Intelligence in 1965 that the Program should be the primary means by which young careerists enter the professional ranks of the Agency. In the wake of this decision, the name was changed to "Career Training Program."

~~SECRET~~

5. In the absence of actual rotational job experience within the Agency--as was practiced in the period 1951-1958--OTR believes that a series of carefully-devised courses is the most appropriate practicable means for measuring a CT's aptitude, interest, and general suitability for a career in a given Directorate or function. Intensive psychological assessments are invaluable, of course, and used to be a standard requirement for all JOTS. About four years ago, however, increased enrollment in the Program, coupled with personnel shortages in the Assessment and Evaluation Staff/OMS and with increased demands by other components for its services, made it necessary for the Career Training Staff to resort to intensive assessments on a severely restricted basis only. The Staff, however, continues to rely on the Professional Applicant Test Battery as one of its evaluative measurements.

6. Our experience shows that an intensive psychological assessment indicates areas of probable strength and weakness on the part of an individual, but is neither a definitive judgment nor a categorical prediction of his potential. The combination in which his particular strengths and weaknesses emerge, in relation to Agency tasks, usually will be determined reliably in the training courses. His performance will be affected, too, by his own attitudes and interests, which are subject to change as he becomes more familiar with the Agency's functions.

7. It is not the purpose of the four introductory courses (Introduction to Intelligence, International Communism, Intelligence Techniques, and Operations Familiarization) to teach students how to do particular jobs in the Agency. Rather, the purpose is twofold--to familiarize CTs with the Agency, its functions, and areas of responsibility within the U. S. Government so that they may achieve a comprehensive understanding of the intelligence process and its component parts; and to subject them within the training situation to a number of representative tasks, intellectual and practical, by which a reasonably valid judgment may be made about their suitability for various types of work in the Agency.

8. All CTs, for example, are required to undertake the intelligence estimate exercise as part of the Intelligence Techniques Course. The purpose of this exercise is not to teach them how to produce an intelligence estimate per se but, as a followup to the general description of the Office of National Estimates presented in the Introduction to Intelligence, to reveal to them firsthand what an intelligence estimate is. Each CT produces an estimate, using limited terms of reference and source documents, for the purpose of determining his aptitude for, and interest in, this and related work in the intelligence production field. If he seems suited to such work, subsequently he will receive the necessary skills training as part of the Intelligence Production Course. If not, he will have at least some understanding of the functions of the Directorate for Intelligence and the Office of National Estimates.

~~SECRET~~

**SECRET**

9. A single introductory familiarization course, such as you have proposed, would have some advantages certainly, especially for the student. The varying of subject matter, instructional technique, and pace on a daily or weekly basis undoubtedly would help sustain student interest in the sense that he would be less likely to become "dried up" through prolonged exposure to a single subject matter.

25X1A

10. On the other hand, there are practical considerations which preclude our establishing an integrated course of this kind. As you know, our Operations Training Staff is located [REDACTED] and is required to conduct training programs which are in addition to, and concurrent with, the Operations Familiarization Course. We do not have the instructor resources at Headquarters to handle this portion of an integrated course; it would be extremely difficult, at best, and certainly an unreasonable stretching of our already thin instructor resources to shuttle staff members between [REDACTED] Headquarters over a six or eight week period.

25X1A

11. Additionally, an integrated course would force a major change in OTR's use of instructors. A given instructor staff, the staff of the School for International Communism for example, would have its commitment to a CT Class changed from an intensive three-week bloc to a piecemeal eight-week involvement. Such a change certainly is possible, but would force a parallel change in other courses and commitments which this staff has during those eight weeks. The same is true for the other OTR instructor staffs and courses. This procedure undoubtedly has major implications for operating offices which typically have preferred training courses to be conducted on a full-time, minimum-duration basis.

12. The proposal made in paragraph (6) of your memorandum does not take into account the fact that, in most cases, a determination is not made concerning a CT's Directorate of assignment until he has completed all four introductory courses. Attempting to make such determination earlier, in my opinion, would be premature, fallacious in too many instances, and therefore liable to costly and time-consuming corrections at a later date. In some cases, it is likely to bring about separations which otherwise might have been avoided. Our present system has proven effective over a considerable period of time in making intelligent and accurate decisions about the placement of CTs. Exceptions have been relatively few.

13. We have made a determined effort, especially in the last several weeks, to eliminate unnecessary duplication and nonessential material from CT courses. In addition, the Operations Familiarization Course recently was reduced from six to four weeks and the Course on International Communism has just been shortened from four to three weeks. The courses are under continual review to assure that the material and instructional techniques are up-to-date, relevant, and effective.

**SECRET**

~~SECRET~~

STATSPEC

STATSPEC

14. In this connection, your suggestion that the Intelligence Production Course be shortened by three weeks through the elimination of the research project is surprising. The research topics are selected from among those recommended by the Offices and Staffs within the Directorate for Intelligence and the exercise, with its results, has been regarded highly by both trainee and operating office. Many of the CTs believe that this research paper is invaluable in providing genuine insights about the area of their job interest. Recently, the Intelligence School/OTR distributed a questionnaire concerning the Intelligence Production Course to DDI offices and to former CTs on duty within the Directorate. The returns have revealed almost 100% support for the course; only the [REDACTED] suggested certain modifications, and these have been introduced.

15. I do not agree with the suggestion that a senior officer from each Directorate be assigned to OTR for the specific purpose of developing a new training program for CTs. Each Directorate already has a senior training officer; in the cases of the Directorates for Support and Plans, there is continuous consultation and interaction between these officers, and their subordinates, and OTR. In the case of the Directorate for Intelligence, there are viable working relationships between the individual offices and staffs and the Intelligence School/OTR. In addition, there are present and former DDI officers in the Intelligence School and on the Career Training Staff. I look forward to the time when the DDI will be able to assign an officer either to be Chief of the Intelligence School or to take over its number two job for specified tours of duty. But a specially-assigned senior officer would, in my opinion, unnecessarily undercut the Chief of the Intelligence School, would create duplication, require a slot which OTR does not have, and would probably leave an officer so assigned in a position without sufficient substance, caught between the Chief, Intelligence School on the one hand and the DDI Senior Training Officer on the other.

16. There is attached to this memorandum a response, compiled by the respective School Chiefs, to specific course changes which you have suggested. Several of these suggestions have been well-taken and are along lines where modifications are being implemented; some reflect an insufficient understanding of the purpose of the particular element in question and the response, therefore, endeavors to clarify that purpose. We much appreciate your interest in the Career Training Program and assure you of our continuing desire that the Program serve the Directorates as fully and realistically as possible. I would be happy to discuss these matters further, if you wish.

25X1A

25X1A

Director of Training

Attachment

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2001/03/04 : CIA-RDP80-00947A000100030002-7

Pois:

Here is [REDACTED] Response

STATINTL

to our suggestions -

While there still may  
be room for argument, OTR

makes a pretty good case  
on most items -

G

Approved For Release 2001/03/04 : CIA-RDP80-00947A000100030002-7